Page 1 of 6 pages. Notice of Removal.

remove this case to the United States District Court for the Northern District of California. Hereinafter, Christina-Kamalam, Alex-Singarayan, Daniel-Andrew.

Removal is requested pursuant to the jurisdiction placed on the Federal Courts by 28 USC, 1446, and its following codes.

The removed case is a civil action filed in the state Court of California, for the Santa Clara Civil Division captioned Plaintiff MOU UN WONG vs. Defendants Christina-Kamalam of the Dawson-family, Alex-Singarayan of the Royappa-family, Daniel-Andrew of the Royappa-family, (being sued as CHRISTINA K. DAWSON a.k.a. CHRISTINA DAWSON, ALEX ROYAPPA, DANIEL ROYAPPA, AMOL SINHA, Does 1 through 5, inclusive.

As required by 28 USC Section 1446(a) and Local Rules, copies of all process pleadings. Orders and other papers of exhibits filed in the State Court with attached Exhibits, have been served on the Plaintiffs timely.

Venue of this removal is correct under 28 USC Sections 1441(a) in the Northern District of California, because of the State Court for Contra Costa cannot have jurisdiction pursuant to matters with the following matters:

- 1. Section 1331, a Federal Question; or,
- 2. Section 1332, diversity.
- 3. Section 1333, admiralty, maritime and prize cases.
- 4. Any of the other areas over which federal courts have original jurisdiction determining what constitutes a federal question.
- 5. The non-registration-as-a-foreign-agent of the MOU UN WONG's purported attorneys, 22 U.S.C. Section 611 and its following codes, hereinafter F.A.R.A..
- 6. The violations of the IRS Code Section 1691 and other IRS codes by the MOU UN WONG purported attorneys.
- 7. The claim exceeds \$75,000.00.
- 8. The violations of the IRS Code Section 1691 and other codes by MOU UN WONG's purported attorneys.
- 9. Implied Duty of Good Faith and Fair Dealing case law, Metcalf, 742 F.3d at 993, and codes and other case laws.

Page 3 of 6 pages. Notice of Removal.

the Court held that Congress may constitutionally create federal Court jurisdiction whenever a federal law is a **potential ingredient** of a case.

The Federal Court Has Broad Discretion with the Ordering of the Consolidation.

A court has broad discretion in determining whether consolidation is practical. Atlantic States Legal Foundation Inc. v Koch Refining Co., 681 F. Supp 609, 615 (D. Minn. 1988). In exercising this discretion, a court weigh the time and effort consolidation would save with any inconvenience or delay it would cause. Hendrix v Raybestos-Manhattan, Inc., 776 F.2d 1492, 1495 (11th Cir. 1985); Huene v United States, 743 F.2d 703, 704 (9th Cir. 1984). See also Kramer v. Boeing Co., 134 F.R.D. 256 (D. Minn. 1991) Consolidation offers efficiency and convenience for this case. Consolidation will result in one trial, which will bind all plaintiffs and defendants. This will save time and avoid unnecessary costs. For the mentioned circumstances, the Federal Court jurisdiction is well founded.

Respectfully,

February 08, 2021 By: Christin - Kamolam

Christina-Kamalam of the Dawson-family

February 08, 2021 By:

Alex-Singarayan of the Royappa-family

Alrix - Lingarayan

February 08, 2021 By: Daniel-Andrew

Daniel-Andrew of the Royappa-family

Joint Statements on the Oath of Christina-Kamalam, Alex-Singarayan, and Daniel-Andrew

Page 4 of 6 pages. Notice of Removal.

- 1. We are over the age of 18 years, and we are the parties of this case. We have personal knowledge of the facts stated with this answer and this Statement on the Oath. If we are called as witnesses, we could and would testify competently to the truth of the facts as stated herein.
- 2. We make this Joint Statement on the Oath under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.
- 3. We executed this Joint Statement on the Oath on February 08, 2021 at Sunnyvale, California.

By: Christia - Kamalam

Christina-Kamalam of the Dawson-family

By: A-Cex Inagaryan

Alex-Singarayan of the Royappa-family

By: Daniel-Andrew

Daniel-Andrew of the Royappa-family

## Proof of Service

I am domiciled at California and over the age of eighteen years. I am not a party to the within action. My business location for the purposes of this service is P.O. Box 823, Millbrae, California. On February 08, 2021 I served the following documents by U.S.P.S. First Class Mail®:

- 1. Notice of the Moving and Removal of the Above-Entitled State Case to the United States District Court for the Northern District of California
- 2. This Proof of Service.

The name and address of the served party is:

Todd Rothbard, Steve Naumchik, Ryan Mayberry, Brian Skarbek, and Christina Dabis c/o The Law Offices of Todd Rothbard

100 Saratoga Avenue, Suite 200

Santa Clara, California [95051]

Page 5 of 6 pages. Notice of Removal.

I make this Statement on the Oath under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and

correct.

Ţυ

February 08, 2021 By: Edward-Leopold of the Novak-family.

Page 6 of 6 pages. Notice of Removal.